

REMARKS

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-7, 9-18, 21, 22, 24, and 26-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over ELSEY et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0184593) in view of CELIK (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0021111). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.¹

By way of the present amendment, Applicants propose canceling claims 1, 5-7, 32, and 33 without prejudice or disclaimer, amending claims 2-4, 9, 10, 15, 16, 18, 21, 26, and 29-31 to improve form, and adding new claims 34-37. No new matter has been added. Claims 2-4, 9-18, 21, 22, 24, 26-31, and 34-37 are pending.

Pending claims 2-4, 9-18, 21, 22, 24, and 26-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over ELSEY et al. in view of CELIK. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended independent claim 10 recites a method for obtaining contact information. The method includes receiving, by a service center, a request initiated by a user for contact information associated with a telephone number; querying, by the service center and in response to the request, a directory for the contact information; querying, by the service center and in response to the request, an Internet search engine for the contact information; receiving the contact information from at least one of the directory and the Internet search engine at the service center; and automatically storing, via the service center, the contact information in a contact list associated with the user in

¹ As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine reference, assertions as to dependent claim, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

response to receiving the contact information at the service center. ELSEY et al. and CELIK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, ELSEY et al. and CELIK do not disclose or suggest querying, by a service center and in response to a request, a directory for the contact information, and querying, by the service center and in response to the request, an Internet search engine for the contact information. In stark contrast, ELSEY et al. merely discloses searching for telephone numbers on databases stored on data servers (see, for example, paragraph 0130). The Examiner relies on CELIK for allegedly disclosing automatically adding contact-related information to an address book (final Office Action, pg. 2). CELIK does not disclose or suggest querying, by a service center and in response to a request, a directory for the contact information, and querying, by the service center and in response to the request, an Internet search engine for the contact information, as recited in claim 10.

Since ELSEY et al. and CELIK do not disclose querying, by a service center and in response to a request, a directory for the contact information, and querying, by the service center and in response to the request, an Internet search engine for the contact information, ELSEY et al. and CELIK cannot disclose or suggest receiving the contact information from at least one of the directory and the Internet search engine at the service center, as also recited in claim 10.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 10 is patentable over ELSEY et al. and CELIK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claims 11-14 depend from claim 10. Therefore, claims 11-14 are patentable over ELSEY et al. and CELIK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 10.

Independent claims 15 and 21 recites features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 10. Therefore, claims 15 and 21 are patentable over ELSEY et al. and CELIK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 10.

Claims 2-4, 9, and 16-18 depend from claim 15. Therefore, claims 2-4, 9, 16-18, and 34-37 are patentable over ELSEY et al. and CELIK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 15.

Claims 22, 24, and 26-31 depend from claim 21. Therefore, claims 22, 24, and 26-31 are patentable over ELSEY et al. and CELIK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 21.

New claims 34-37 depend from claim 15. Therefore, claims 34-37 are patentable over ELSEY et al. and CELIK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 15.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and the timely allowance of this application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the

filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070
and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: /Meagan S. Walling, Reg. No. 60112/
Meagan S. Walling
Reg. No. 60,112

Date: October 31, 2007
11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800

Customer No. 32127